

Christianity and Crisis

A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion

VOL. VIII, No. 3

MARCH 1, 1948

\$2.00 per year; 10 cents per copy

The Federation of Western Europe

EVER since Foreign Minister Bevin's advocacy of the federation of western Europe and Winston Churchill's emphasis upon the political and military desirability of a Western alliance, many students of foreign affairs have hailed the prospect of the unification of Europe as a desirable step in the present world situation. Norman Angell, in his new study of international affairs entitled "The Steep Places," comes to the conclusion that only such an alliance can prevent the recurrence of the theme with which Hitler made us familiar and which Stalin threatens to reenact: One nation after the other will be brought under Russian control unless all covenant to come to the defense of each.

In order to estimate the value of a western European alliance we must bear in mind that there are two facets to our present problem. The one is given by the fact that the world is divided in two and that Russia will seek to increase the breadth and extent of the half of the world which it holds. The other facet of our problem is given by the fact that the world is not completely divided in two and that it is not in our interest or in the interest of peace that it be divided more deeply or absolutely than is already the case.

On the economic level western Europe requires a custom union and broad monetary agreements to encourage the free flow of goods across national boundaries. Some such union is absolutely essential. But western Europe is not an economic unity. Its economic health requires not only unity among the Western nations but also a constant increase of trade with the nations of eastern Europe. Any political alliance which discourages the development of East-West trade and which pushes the smaller nations, behind the iron curtain, outside of the European economy, will retard European recovery and will increase our burden in maintaining the economic health of Europe.

It is not generally recognized that the European Recovery Program is intended to encourage, and not discourage, the resumption of East-West trade. A thoughtful reporter for the *New York Times* re-

ports: "Europeans hope that political tensions will not get so bad that sensible traders on both sides may not continue their efforts to release their natural forces of commerce from some of the many chains that bind them." An explicit western European political alliance would certainly aggravate those tensions.

We do of course face a political as well as an economic task. We know that the primary defense against communism in western Europe is the restoration of Europe's economic health. But we must also be prepared to stand against political aggression. Is Sir Norman Angell right in suggesting that a covenant in which all would come to the defense of each would discourage such aggression? The answer is no. The whole of Europe is not strong enough to prevent aggression. From a purely strategic standpoint the only thing that matters is what our own country would do in such a case. If we are obviously in Europe and intend to stay there, that might well prevent aggression. There is no particular value in Norway's promise to come to the help of Greece, or Belgium's promise to come to the aid of France. France is furthermore threatened not by some military venture against her security but by political conspiracies within. The offensive and defensive alliance of western Europe does not, therefore, have great positive value.

There are, on the other hand, real political hazards in such an alliance. It would certainly divide Europe more absolutely than it is now divided. It would force certain "border" nations, such as Poland and Czechoslovakia, more absolutely into the Eastern zone. It would give a certain plausibility to the Russian propaganda charge that the "militarists" and "imperialists" are preparing for war. Let us not forget that all strategies of defense against assumed aggression appear to be, and indeed are, strategies of offense from the viewpoint of the opposite side. We must understand the pathos of these vicious circles of mutual fear even though we know that it would be unwise to break them by making ourselves defenseless. Though we cannot break through the cir-

cle by a venture in disarmament, we can at least minimize purely strategic measures, if we are convinced, as we ought to be, that the primary strategy of defense is economic rather than military; and that the primary source of military defense is American power and not European alliances.

Finally it is not to our interest to destroy the few remaining pillars of the bridge between ourselves and Russia. For all we know Russia may become much more amenable than she now is, if the European Recovery Program succeeds. Certainly trade agreements with her should be encouraged even now. The purposes which are assigned to the western European alliance can much better be served within the framework of the General Assembly of the United Nations. The assembly can become, and is indeed becoming, an instrument for bringing cohesion and a sense of common purpose into the Western world. It cannot, of course, become an instrument for military strategy against Russia.

We are living in a world which is neither one in organization nor yet consistently divided in two. Let us not be more consistent than history is. Our hope lies in protecting ourselves at the points where the world is divided, but also in preserving the tenuous threads which still unite it.

R. N.

Editorial Notes

Some of the anti-Niemöller sentiment in this country was given grist for its mill recently when the newspapers reported that the intrepid Pastor had advised Germans to defy the de-Nazification courts. General Clay had taken notice of this defiance with the observation that criticism of law was a democratic right, but defiance of law was an invitation to disorder. General Clay was right. Pastor Niemöller should have been content to criticize.

But few of his critics have any notion of the validity of his criticism of our de-Nazification procedure. By an odd coincidence a congressional committee in the very same week criticized various aspects of our policy in Germany, and among other things, demanded that a general amnesty be granted to all the smaller fry among the people who are accused of complicity with Nazism. There is, in short, no question about the inadequacy of the whole program of de-Nazification. The very mildness of General Clay's rebuke probably attests the fact that the General is conscious of this inadequacy. Certainly

there are hundreds of able men in our military government who know of its evils.

We might well list a few of the difficulties in our present procedure: 1) Millions of people, involved in various degrees of complicity with Nazism, stand accused. It will take years before they can all be tried and either punished or vindicated. They are meanwhile under suspicion. The accusations never took into account that in an evil system thousands upon thousands would become involved in the evil without explicit acceptance of the tenets of Nazism. Our de-Nazification procedures assume that all men ought to be heroes and be ready to sacrifice everything rather than become involved, even indirectly, in an evil system.

2) The original separation of sheep from goats took place through the mechanical procedure of a questionnaire. According to the questionnaire a man might be guilty if he joined the Nazi party before a certain date, and innocent if he joined it after that date. The guilt of the early adhesion was not purged by subsequent resignation from the party, or an official position in a party organization connoted guilt, while mere membership did not. Under this provision thousands of village schoolteachers were brought into the category of the guilty because they had accepted the position of village treasurer of a Nazi relief organization.

3) The German courts, dealing with these cases have become notorious for miscarriages of justice, due to political pressures of various kinds in various localities. Sometimes they have been explicitly corrupt. It is sad to report that the German community is not yet capable of handing out an even-handed justice. The courts have frequently been used to settle old scores.

The original intention of our de-Nazification procedures was to give the Germans an example of the majesty and purity of justice. The realities stand in tragic contradiction to this intention. Our authorities have been much too slow to acknowledge the flaws in our procedure and the corruptions in their application. It was high time that the rumblings of resentment should reach open expression.

The expansion of our editorial interests, as announced in the last issue, has met with the most cordial response from our readers. We appreciate the many letters of commendation which we have received and also the large number of new subscriptions.

R. N.

Prophet With Honor

A Study of William Scarlett

CLIFFORD L. STANLEY

WHEN we try to convey the quality of a person we have known, even though we have had many significant contacts with him, we realize for the first time the difficulties of such an essay and begin to understand our debt to those who have mediated to us the great figures of the past.

Toward a Juster Social Order

It is not, however, difficult to know how to begin this present sketch. The social concern and activity of Bishop Scarlett naturally came first to mind. When I first went to Missouri there occurred a great social disturbance in the cotton-growing part of the state known as "The Roadside Demonstration." Learning that they would have to share their A.A.A. benefit payments with their tenants, the planters of southeast Missouri resorted to mass evictions. Because they had nowhere else to go, the dispossessed farmer camped on the wide shoulders of the road. At once the Bishop requested me, because of my proximity to the affair, to be his eyes and ears. He himself went to the Governor and it is due to his plea that extreme violence and bloodshed were avoided. Later he went, with others, to the Secretary of Agriculture in Washington and appealed to Mrs. Roosevelt on behalf of the ousted farmers. As a result of their appeal, the Farm Security Administration set the farmers up in small homesteads of several acres. Years later when the F.S.A. was forced, vengefully, to liquidate its assets, William Scarlett again intervened and was powerful in the organization of a corporation which bought these homesteads in a block and is now financing the purchase of the farms by the owners.

Though it has taken different forms, the interest of William Scarlett in practical, social applications of Christianity has never wavered. He began his work at St. George's, New York, in the days of William Rainsford and the appearance of the so-called "institutional parish." Later on he took a hand in direct mediation of labor disputes. In one case, involving sweat-shop labor, he was forced to side against one of the important families of his own cathedral parish. In another case, in which rival mining unions clashed, he had a memorable encounter with John L. Lewis. A few years ago he brought industrialists and union leaders together in a discussion group where apart from specific issues each side could present its own point of view and explore that of the other side.

Several years ago Bishop Scarlett formed a group

to deal with the race problem in St. Louis. This group later became the nucleus of the Mayor's Interracial Commission. It was said, responsibly, that this group prevented the open outbreak of interracial violence at a time when such discord was appearing in cities with large Negro population, as is the case of St. Louis.

His interest in racial matters gives opportunity to note a characteristic of Bishop Scarlett's activity. He does not scatter his interest over the whole field but rather concentrates, stressing one objective at a given moment. Latterly it has been the "race problem." This has opened him to the attacks of certain residents of Missouri, a "border state" where a peculiarly fierce form of race prejudice is sometimes to be found. Again, he understands the value of simplifying a problem and taking one portion at a time. In the present instance, he says that the achievable objective for which to aim is "equality of opportunity." This has included for him an attack on segregation, for he considers that segregation is an enemy of equality of opportunity, and there can be no equality under segregation.

In his church social activities two matters deserve special mention. First, he has for years labored for a liberalizing of the divorce laws of the Episcopal Church. He did this not as a concession to modern laxity in marriage, but in protest against a legalism and perfectionism reserved for one kind of human weakness and failure alone. Second, he is chairman of the Church's Social Reconstruction committee, a committee set up to parallel a like body in the Church of England, headed by the late Archbishop Temple. This commission is charged with the responsibility of expressing and educating the social conscience of the Episcopal Church. A recent notable achievement of the Commission was the production of the widely distributed Penguin volume, "Christianity Takes a Stand," a symposium on current problems by outstanding writers.

Not least of Bishop Scarlett's social activities is his participation in the development of the group, Americans for Democratic Action (A.D.A.). It is characteristic of him that he rejoices in the fact that one of his clergy is chairman in St. Louis of the rival organization, Progressive Citizens of America (P.C.A.).

Peace in Thy Church

In the field of interchurch cooperation, William Scarlett has played an important and grateful part.

In the '30s he burst into public notice through an incident of this kind. A group called the Christian Unity League held a convention in St. Louis, culminating in a Communion Service. For this service the Cathedral and its altar were made available. A minister who was not an Episcopalian conducted the service. For this generous act the bishop was subjected to the severest censure in his own communion; indeed, the matter was agitated in the house of Bishops. The Cathedral parish house, the Bishop Tuttle Memorial, which was built when he was dean, was supported by the general community and has ever been available for groups of the most general character. I have heard Stanley Jones speak there to the ministerial alliance. Each year the Cathedral is used for Lenten services of the Metropolitan Church Federation. Many instances of a like ecclesiastical hospitality could be given.

One of the most remarkable expressions of his cooperation with religionists beyond his own group is his relation with the Jews of Temple Israel and their famous Rabbi, Ferdinand Isserman. So appreciative of the spirit of Bishop Scarlett has this group been that some years ago they gave a wonderful pair of doors for the Cathedral Baptistry. One door is ornamented with Jewish symbols and the other with Christian devices. Each year the two congregations worship "the God of Abraham" in a joint service.

For many years the Bishop was a firm and enthusiastic believer in cooperation between Catholics, Protestants and Jews and was a chief figure in the local group furthering that end, the St. Louis Round Table. His deepest desire is for cooperation between Catholics and Protestants, and in recent months he has organized a small group of Catholic and Protestant clergy who are exploring points of tension between their respective groups. Above all things he deprecates open struggle between the groups with its attendant ungenerousness and vulgarity. Nevertheless, he has come slowly to believe that Catholics do not wish to cooperate but rather to dominate and dispossess others. In line with this conviction he was one of a small group which met recently in Washington to explore the whole subject of Catholic infiltration into public school funds and other aggressive acts. The Catholic group must be quite sure of itself and care little for the best thought beyond its borders to arouse so moderate and charitable a man.

Two or three years ago the Knights of Columbus began running some very plain-speaking advertisements in the two Sunday papers of St. Louis. The Protestant community was so aroused that a commission was set up by the Metropolitan Church Federation to cope with the matter. William Scarlett was made chairman of this commission. Some of the more forthright and hot-blooded members of the commission wanted to reply with countering advertisements, returning blow for blow. The Bishop-

chairman was so moderate and reluctant that he was criticized by some of his own fellow-workers. After many efforts and discussions the commission decided to arrange a great Reformation Day service in the city auditorium. The auditorium itself was filled and the crowd overflowed into the adjacent opera house. Seventeen thousand people were admitted and four thousand turned away. It was the greatest outpouring of Protestants in the history of the city and perhaps in recent times in America. The service has since inspired many like outpourings in other American cities. Bishop Bromley Oxnam, then president of the Federal Council of Churches, spoke at the service, using it for a formal pronouncement upon Protestant reactions to Roman claims and aggression. The pronouncement and the occasion itself were covered fully in the national press.

First Among Equals

Recently a Jew gave fifteen hundred dollars to the support of the Cathedral parish house. The letter which accompanied it was written to the Cathedral Dean, Sidney Sweet. It said that the donor "is grateful for the tremendous religious, civic and charitable contributions that you and Bishop Scarlett have made to this community and to the nation." This sentence will serve to introduce another characteristic of the subject of this sketch, his extraordinary ability to work with and arouse the loyal labor of gifted men. Of the increasing company of these, Sidney Sweet is easily the first. Anyone who knows the two men inevitably thinks of them together. Their collaboration has continued for years and is beyond description sensitive and effective. Each one complements the gifts of the other and though they disagree on occasion, they say one thing. In estimating the stature of William Scarlett, one of the chief items would be his ability to win the devoted loyalty, at times sacrificial in character, of a man of the gifts of Sidney Sweet.

But what is true of Dean Sweet is true of a host of others in their lesser degrees. Many of these I have known. Most of them are attractive, able, strongly marked. Most of them are young! Most of them were surprised to find personal loyalty looming so largely in their lives. They might have thought that to be something left behind in more generous youth. But they rejoiced to be loyal to William Scarlett, as a special qualification of their loyalty to Christ and his church. This loyalty did not belittle them but rather enhanced their significance. And finding the same sentiment in the other members of the group each one felt his affections warmed to the others. I cannot speak for other communions, but I regard this fellowship in its liveliness and inwardness as unique in the Episcopal Church. This fellowship in turn became the basis of many activities. On the one hand it flowered in numerous social

events. On the other it gave rise to the most exciting experiment in group learning which I have seen to this day.

Thy Household the Church

In addition to the other activities mentioned, William Scarlett is an administrator in one of the churches in which the church of Christ comes to concrete expression in our day. Though his activities in this field are of less general interest than the foregoing, a few things may be mentioned. The first is his procedure in consolidating and building up the work of the Diocese of Missouri. Here he seems almost to have put all his eggs in one basket. So much does he believe in the fruitfulness of good men that his main, almost his only, strategy is to select such men for his posts and then expect great things! He inquires ceaselessly to discover such men. He travels around the country to find them. He seldom accepts a man sight unseen. Rarely is he disappointed in his efforts to secure a parson when he has made up his mind to invite him to Missouri. Many of these clergy are men whose natural orbit would never have extended to that part of the country. But the inducements are such that they find themselves there, perhaps greatly to their surprise. And life is never the same again! Once the man is installed the Bishop gives him a free hand, sometimes almost too free a hand. But the theory is that each man must be trusted to give his own best contribution, and do it in his way.

A generation ago there was in St. Louis an Episcopal home for orphans. As time went on orphanages went out of style and finally the foundation was left with considerable endowment but no orphans. The problem arose: what to do with the endowments. A number of possibilities were considered but, at the instance of the Bishop, an educational project was finally created. The idea was that Christian indoctrination ought to be as effective as Nazi or Communist education. This project has engaged in research under its directors, Matthew Warren and Charles Pen-neman, with their co-worker, Frances Bailey. The Educational Center has been a unique resource for the diocese, and its services have been required by many outside the diocese.

Theological Outlook

Theologically it is difficult to identify Bishop Scarlett. This is partly due to his practical temper of mind. He is less interested in determining the possibilities of Christian effort than in actualizing those possibilities, and in this way encountering the limits of the achievable experimentally. In his case that is sound, but in other men such an unwillingness to raise ultimate issues sometimes masks utopian illusions. William Scarlett is not doctrinaire for theological

reasons, though a naturally intense disposition may lead him to fervor and singleness of devotion to a cause which simulates the attitude of the doctrinaire. Thus when many liberals, between wars, were espousing doctrinaire pacifism he avoided it. Yet now his fervor about the race issue is like that of persons whose motives are perfectionist in origin.

Another reason for the difficulty in identifying him theologically is his extraordinary generosity and respect for men who hold positions that are not his own. He wants these men to have their say; he believes it to be valuable and important for them to have it. He is, for example, quite sympathetic personally with the kind of theology held by Reinhold Niebuhr. He is willing to subject his spirit to its impact. Yet he prefers to call himself a liberal and professes to be unable to recognize himself in the strictures laid upon liberals nowadays. Whatever the name of his position, he believes that men should be challenged with the steepest demands of service to their fellows, that they should open their hearts to these demands without reserve and that they should strive in their service to the limit. If this be liberalism he is glad to be called a liberal.

Power With God

There is one final matter. Though I have saved it for the last it may well be the most characteristic element in our subject. I refer to the interest of William Scarlett in the life of prayer and personal devotion to an explicitly personal God. There is something almost old-fashioned about his preoccupation with private prayer. The signs of its practice are unmistakable upon him, and more than one of us has asked his prayers for ourselves, remembering that "the prayer of the righteous availeth much." He counsels the life of personal religiousness to those whom he confirms. He recommends it to his clergy as the secret of ministerial faithfulness.

This concern with praying to the Father in secret, which a man does when he enters the closet and shuts the door, is instantly evident in his conduct of public worship. In his case no one can level the charge, so often made against liturgical worship, that it is mere form. Formal worship becomes incandescent in his employment of it. His instinct for reality in worship is responsible for his free revisions of the Prayer Book services, a practice which edifies some as much as it shocks others.

His concern with the life of prayer comes out chiefly in the prayers and devotions he composes. Some of these are used widely and have become part of the tradition. One of the features of life in the diocese of Missouri is the use by him of these treasures of prayer, whether in clergy gatherings or wider assemblages. No one who has shared them can forget those towering, piled up masses of prayer,

those pouring cataracts of petition and communion. One of his favorite exercises in this general field is to rewrite, in modern speech, some well-known Biblical passage, such as the Parable of the Good Samaritan, or the Last Judgment in Matthew, Ch. 25.

I remember one such use of a Scripture passage. It was at the diocesan convention. He stood before the great reredos in Christ Church Cathedral, that majestic composition which Ralph Adams Cram said was the finest thing of its kind since the Middle Ages. Such surroundings so often mean soft phrases and weakening emotions. William Scarlett stood before this splendor and recited the Beatitudes, with no book in hand. When he came to the words, "Blessed are ye when men shall revile you and persecute you and speak all manner of evil against you falsely for my sake," I thought of the things that I knew and my soul declared to itself, "This day is the Scripture fulfilled in your ears."

Rochester Inter-Faith Committee Statement

IN view of the current controversy between Catholics and Protestants, it will be of interest to our readers to study the following statement of the Inter-faith Goodwill Committee of Rochester, New York. This Committee is singular rather than typical because it contains the most influential members of the three religious groups of Rochester, including the Catholic Bishop whose signature is attached to the statement, together with that of other Catholic officials of the diocese, three Jewish Rabbis, four Protestant ministers, and various laymen. The Committee was formed in 1934. The statement in part is as follows:

"The Catholic, Protestant and Jewish Communion in this city, through official representatives, have organized a permanent body known as the Inter-Faith Goodwill Committee to express their sense of comradeship and to consider such issues as may arise which are of common concern.

"The confusion of the time offers to the members of these communions an opportunity to achieve a deeper understanding and appreciation of one another. It also challenges them to emphasize in their moral and religious outlook the great common principles which they believe to be the basis of our civilization.

"The members of these communions, for instance, share the belief in the spiritual nature of man and in man's supreme responsibility to God. They are also united in the desire to maintain the rights of men, civil and religious, which are the foundation pillars of the Republic, and which are guaranteed to our citizens by the Constitution.

"We welcome the public discussion of every question of common concern. We recognize that there are times when the public discussion of religious as well as political differences may be a necessity if our democracy is to function in a healthy way. We believe, however, that such discussion should be carried on without impugning the loyalty of the great body of our people, Catholic, Protestant and Jewish, to the foundation principles of the Republic. Unless we recognize this common loyalty, fraternal relations become difficult and the mutual confidence essential to our working together in community enterprise becomes imperiled.

"Such mutual confidence is more than ever necessary in these times when we face tasks upon the successful accomplishment of which the fate of civilization itself depends. We still have to make peace and avert another world war. We have to organize our economy to provide for the needs of all without sacrificing our liberties to the tyranny of a police state. We have to find types of education that will make man, as a spiritual being, master of the science and technology that, uncontrolled, will destroy him. We have to fight racial discrimination and a deadening secularism that denies the religious basis of life.

"The differences in outlook that separate us are important. It is essential that we acknowledge and study them. But it would be tragic if in considering these differences we should drift into attitudes of hopeless antagonism toward one another. The religious and racial conflicts of the old world with their bitter consequences warn us against this danger. Along with the emphasis on differences, let there be also a common quest for a deeper understanding of the spiritual objectives of these great religious groups and their ways of life. From such understanding may come a new spiritual climate in which the work of all the communions may be more fruitful."

U.S.S.R.: Metropolitan Theophilus of North America Summoned Before Council of Bishops

The Patriarch of the Russian Orthodox Church in Moscow has decided to summon Theophilus, Metropolitan of the North American Orthodox Church, before the Council of Bishops, as the highest court of the Church, on the ground that he has broken off relations with the Mother Church.

The same measures have been taken in respect to the Archbishops Leonty of Chicago, John of Alaska, John of Brooklyn, and Bishop Nikon, who has recently emigrated to America. They are accused of contravening the decision taken in Cleveland in 1946 which recognized the Patriarch as their spiritual head, while at the same time preserving the autonomy of the Church in America. E. P. S. Geneva.

The World Church News and Notes

Czechoslovakia: Manifesto Asks Christians Promote Brotherhood

A manifesto calling upon Christians the world over to join in promoting peace and brotherhood among nations, was issued at a joint gathering in Prague, attended by leading government officials and representatives of all Christian denominations in Czechoslovakia.

First of its kind there in centuries, the meeting was attended by 6,000 persons who applauded the reading of the manifesto which was signed by leaders of eleven Churches. These were: Roman Catholic, Greek Catholic, Greek Orthodox, Old Catholic, Czech Brethren, Slovak Reformed, Slovak Lutheran, Czechoslovak, Czech Evangelical, Baptist and Methodist.

Declaring that only through the observance of Christian principles can another war be prevented, the manifesto appealed to governments to "vanquish mistrust and fear between nations" and called upon Christians "to collaborate in brotherhood" toward preserving peace and promoting humanitarian aims.

"Christianity's voice urging peace must be heard before political interests," the manifesto declared. It stressed that Czechs must fulfill their duty by setting an example to the world in the way they solve their own problems.

Among those attending the meeting were Foreign Minister Jan Masaryk, Health Minister Adolf Prochazka, Information Minister Vaclav Kopecky, the Most Rev. Joseph Beran, Roman Catholic Archbishop of Prague, and leading representatives of the Protestant and Greek Orthodox Churches.

R. N. S.

Hungary: Radio Censorship Hit By Church

The Lutheran Church of Hungary has discontinued the broadcast of church services until further notice, because the management of the Hungarian radio system has demanded that all sermons be subjected to censorship before being preached over the air.

In an announcement, Bishop Lajos Ordass asserted that under such conditions the Church feels itself bound not to use the microphone. He said that no secular authority has the right to sit in judgment over the proclamation of the Church, and that this right belongs only to the bishop of the diocese.

A similar effort at censorship was made by the Hungarian radio during the Nazi occupation. After weeks of discussion, however, the attempt was abandoned. Church members now hope that the question will soon be solved in such a way that the broadcasts may be resumed.

News Bureau, National Lutheran Council.

Yugoslavia: The Serbian Orthodox Church Today

A correspondent writes: "The Serbian Orthodox Patriarchal Church had suffered heavy losses during the years of occupation. Three Serbian Bishops and

many priests were put to death as martyrs. Two thousand churches were destroyed and many monasteries looted. In Croatia alone 16 monasteries were laid waste. Since the Church is separated from the State, and since agrarian reform has been carried out, the Church has had to give up all its property. Only in the case of the historic churches and monasteries, they were allowed to retain 30 yokes of land.

But these external difficulties have brought inner renewal to the Orthodox Church. The churches have never been as full as they are today. Church-goers give most generously to the support of the clergy, who receive nothing today either from the State or from the Church. So that the congregations now form a closed body within the Church—a very encouraging fact.

Daily services are held every morning and evening in all the churches. There is no censorship on the preaching, except from the church authorities themselves. During the last few months six new Bishops have been consecrated and three new bishoprics have been created. It is planned to consecrate more bishops in the summer of 1948, in order to fill those positions which are still vacant.

The Serbian Orthodox Church has a theological Faculty in Belgrad (the Roman Catholic Church has two, in Zagreb and Ljubljana). The Orthodox Church also has two colleges for priests in Belgrad and Prizren, in Southern Serbia. The staff of the Faculty, which was closed during the war, is composed of 16 professors and lecturers, who give the usual lectures held in Orthodox theological Faculties.

In spite of the separation of Church and State, the Theological Faculty is still part of the University. The State has contributed a great deal towards the renewal of the Faculty. There are no State authorities at the lectures. The relation between teachers and students is like that between the members of a family. In order to help the most promising students, the professors have given up part of their own salaries. There is great enthusiasm for the studies, so that the Church can draw daily on new forces for its work for God's Kingdom.

Relations with the other Faculties are much better today than before the war. There are at present 145 students in the Theological Faculty, who will probably be ordained as soon as they have passed their final examination. In addition to the usual lectures, emergency courses are being held, to educate clergy for the smaller churches in the villages.

There is no anti-religious propaganda in Yugoslavia. But there is no longer any official religious instruction given in the public schools. Hence the teachers of religion are not paid by the State (except in the people's republics of Croatia and Slovenia very often). Participation in religious instruction, which is given during free periods on the curriculum, is voluntary. The Church arranges collections to pay the teachers, and people give very generously.

There is a great lack of adequate Christian literature, since the religious libraries have in many cases been decimated. The library of the Theological Faculty

Christianity and Crisis

A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion
537 West 121st St., New York 27, N. Y.

EDITORIAL BOARD

REINHOLD NIEBUHR, *Chairman*

JOHN C. BENNETT	LISTON POPE
F. ERNEST JOHNSON	HENRY P. VAN DUSEN
GLOSTER MORRIS, <i>Secretary</i>	

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

JAMES C. BAKER	HENRY SMITH LEIPER
HENRY SLOANE COFFIN	JOHN A. MACKAY
CHARLES W. GILKEY	RHODA E. MCCULLOCH
LYNN HAROLD HOUGH	FRANCIS P. MILLER
UMPHREY LEE	EDWARD L. PARSONS
HOWARD CHANDLER ROBBINS	

in Belgrad was almost completely destroyed. The publication of Orthodox writings, which are comprehensible to everyone, is an important task.

Christian youth work, which was undertaken before the war by the Y.M.C.A. and other youth organizations, is now organized by the teachers of religion.

E. P. S., Geneva.

Thanksgiving Fund for the Church of South India

By the spring of 1947 the official bodies of the four Churches had approved the entry of their respective Churches into the Church of South India. In view of

the careful and extended nature of these negotiations from 1919 to 1946, one can readily imagine the shock which Anglicans in South India received when they learned that the Standing Committee of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, meeting in England in May, 1947, passed a resolution which terminated the salaries of their forty-four missionaries and workers, plus grants from the General and Medical Fund, amounting to 25,000 pounds as of December 31, 1947. This meant that missionaries on the ground, if they entered into the plan in which they believed it was the will of God for them to enter, would cut themselves off from their source of income. Thus it became obvious that those in the Church of England who were opposed to union were going to try to prevent, by economic pressure, the Anglican Church in South India from entering into the union.

Fortunately, Dr. Fisher, the present Archbishop of Canterbury, realized the enormous injustice of this move on the part of the Society for the Promotion of the Gospel, in view of the fact that the Lambeth Conference, the Archbishops, and the Derby Commission had given the Anglicans in South India such strong encouragement to proceed with the union. At the meeting of the Standing Committee of the Society in June the Archbishop presided and reviewed the entire relationship of the Church of England and the proposed union of the Churches in South India. As a result of this meeting the original motion of the Society was rescinded and after a very heated discussion a motion followed which "sanctions" the acceptance of subscriptions for the work in South India, with the proviso that the monies thus collected be kept in a separate fund, and the recognition that "such payments do not necessarily involve any verdict on the status or principles of the South India Scheme."

In view of the problem thus raised, those who believe that the Church of South India is not simply important in itself but may pave the way for unity in other parts of the world, are obliged to do everything they can to give it their immediate support and that as generously as possible. In the face of this situation, the Continuation Committee of the Church of South India, which is the executive committee of the Church entrusted with the carrying on of the work of the Church until the first meeting of the Synod of the Church, 1948, established a Thanksgiving Fund to which it is hoped all who are interested in the success of the Church of South India will give. In order to facilitate the rapid transmission of funds, Mr. Harold Belcher of The American Board of Foreign Missions has graciously agreed to forward any contributions to Bishop Hollis in Madras for the Thanksgiving Fund. Kindly make your checks payable to The American Board of Foreign Missions and send them to the office of the Board, 14 Beacon Street, Boston, Massachusetts, in care of Mr. Harold Belcher with the request that it be sent to Bishop Hollis.

Author in This Issue

Clifford L. Stanley is Professor at The Virginia Theological Seminary, Alexandria, Virginia.

Periodical Division
Detroit Public Library
5201 Woodward Ave.
Detroit 2, Mich.

650 1-49